

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,773	09/12/2003	Kouichi Tada	100341-00046	5773
4372 ARENT FOX I	7590 11/29/200 LLP	EXAMINER		
1050 CONNEC SUITE 400	CTICUT AVENUE, N.	TRAN, THANG V		
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2627	
				•
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/29/2007	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DCIPDocket@arentfox.com IPMatters@arentfox.com Patent\_Mail@arentfox.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/660,773	TADA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Thang V. Tran	2627	

	Thang V. Tran	2627					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 08 November 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> </ol>	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in one with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply monor of the final rejection.	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C ust be filed within one	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) of the following				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri	ate extension fee				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I  (a) They raise new issues that would require further con  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO` w);	TE below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a			the issues for				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 Soc attached Nation of Non Co		(DTOL 224)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		inpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate,						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☑ wil vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a l).				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.		n condition for allowar	nce because:				
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	•					
		/Thang V. Tran/ Primary Examiner					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the reference signal in Kumon is not the reproduced signal that is changed according to the rotation of the disk. Yes, the reference signal in Kumon is not the reproduced signal that is changed according to the rotation of the disk; however, this limitation is not recited in the claimed invention. Accordingly, applicant argues limitation that is not recited in the claims, and therefore, it cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art. Also, Applicant should note that Kumon uses the measured wobble cycles to determine the kinds of DVDs; however, the DVD 2.6GB and the DVD 4.7GB disclosed in Kumon are not DVD-RW nor DVD+RW as applicant interpreted. Therefore, applicant cannot use the count values used to determine the DVD 2.6BG or DVD 4.7GB in Kumon to show the difference between applicant's claimed invention and that in Kumon.